DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 676 CS 501 387

AUTHOR Wenner, Lawrence A.
TITLE Citizen Involvement in Public Television.
PUB DATE Nov 75
NOTE 60p.; Study prepared at the University of Iowa; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizen Participation; Educational Television; *Financial Policy; Mass Media; *Policy Formation; *Programing (Broadcast); *Public Television; Telecommunication
IDENTIFIERS ACNO; Advisory Council of National Organizations; Carnegie Commission; *Corporation for Public Broadcasting; CPB; National Citizens Committee for Public Television; PBS; PTV; *Public Broadcasting System

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the amount and quality of citizen involvement in public television. From the perspective of the "average citizen," the concept of involvement is considered with regard to the Carnegie Commission, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) borad of directors, the National Citizens Committee for Public Television, the Public Broadcasting System (PBS) borad of governors, the Committee for Public Television, the Advisory Council of National Organizations to CPB, the "friends" organizations, the current status of community ascertainment procedures, a survey of public television stations, and the possibilities for citizen involvement as demonstrated by station KVST, Los Angeles. A preliminary survey considers issues of involvement in terms of financing, programming, and policymaking. The conclusion suggests that public television is becoming big business and is excluding the public. All efforts toward citizen involvement by the Public Television hierarchy have been "after the fact" considerations, the net result of which is a discouragingly low level of citizen involvement. (Author/KS)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED123676

# CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN PUBLIC TELEVISION

Lawrence A. Wenner

University of Iowa

November 1975

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lawrence A. Wenner

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

CS 501 387

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ABSTRACT

Wenner, Lawrence. "Citizen Involvement in Public Television." This study attempts to assess and evaluate the amount and quality of citizen involvement in public television. From the perspective of the "average citizen" the concept of citizen involvement is considered with regards to the Carnegie Commission, the CPB Board of Directors, the National Citizens Committee for Public Television, the PBS board of Governors, the Advisory Council of National Organizations to CPB, the "friends" organizations, the current status of community ascertainment procedures, a survey of public television stations and the possibilities for citizen involvement as demonstrated by station KVST Los Angeles. The most important consequence of the study was the development of a graduated scale for further, more accurate measurement of citizen involvement. The development of the scale was made possible from the nature of the response to the preliminary survey of public television stations. The preliminary survey considered issues of citizen involvement in terms of (1) financing, (2) programming, and (3) policymaking. The conclusion sensed that in the process of public television becoming big media business with an immense bureaucratic structure, the public was left out. At the initiation of public television, the concept of citizen involvement was not even considered. All efforts towards citizen involvement by the PTV hierarchy have been "after the fact" considerations, the net result being a discouragingly low level of citizen involvement.

CONTENTS


I. INTRODUCTION. . . . . 1

II. THE CARNEGIE COMMISSION AND THE "CITIZEN" . . . . 6

III. THE CPB BOARD AND THE "CITIZEN" . . . . . 10

IV. THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE AND THE "CITIZEN". . . . . 14

V. THE PBS BOARD AND THE "CITIZEN" . . . . . 16

VI. ACNO. . . . . 20

VII. FRIENDS AND "CITIZENS". . . . . 23

VIII. ASCERTAINING COMMUNITY NEEDS. . . . . 26

IX. SURVEY OF PTV STATIONS. . . . . 30

X. KVST'S CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT. . . . . 40

XI CONCLUSION. . . . . 43

APPENDIX . . . . . 46

NOTES. . . . . 50

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 53

# I. INTRODUCTION

The intent of this study is to assess and evaluate the amount and quality of citizen involvement in public television. Since the word "public" is rather conspicuously included in the terms public television and public broadcasting, it would appear that a reasonable assumption to make would be that the public (e.g., individual citizens and citizens groups) would have an essential working role in the functions public television seeks to serve. The validity of such an assumption, as it turns out, is based on an untested hypothesis. Does the public really have anything to do with public television? What kinds of efforts are being made to involve citizens in public television? Is citizen involvement an "after the fact" consideration of public television administrators? Questions such as these certainly need to be answered. Relatively speaking, the major problem is that no one has even bothered asking the questions.

Indeed, a preliminary search of the literature in the field produced no book, article, thesis or paper which concerned itself primarily with the problems of citizen involvement in public television. This is not to say that no one in public television is concerned about citizen involvement, rather it serves to point out that no serious attempts to take stock of the issue have been made. Perhaps to many this is not cause for public uproar, but to others who are discouraged

by the low level of citizen access to media in general, the issue of citizen involvement is a matter to be greatly concerned about.

Admittedly an ambiguous term, citizen involvement is many things to many people. Within the context of public television, concepts of citizen involvement run the gamut from a viewer donating five dollars to support the local PTV station to citizens actively involved in the programming and policymaking processes of CPB, PBS or the local PTV station.

Both ends of the spectrum are legitimate examples of citizen involvement. By looking at the complete spectrum of citizen involvement, this study seeks to make an estimation and evaluation of the mean level of that involvement. To get a better idea of the complete spectrum, the study proposes to use an arbitrary frame of reference to characterize the amount of citizen involvement within public television. The terms proposes are for use in evaluating the levels of citizen involvement within both the national and local structures of public television with regards to both individual citizen involvement and citizen group or organization involvement.

The scale for evaluating citizen involvement was probably the most important outcome of this preliminary study of the area. The scale attempts to characterize minimum requirements of advancing levels of citizen involvement. Thus, the following scale is proposed to help clarify the terms and

definitions being used to evaluate citizen involvement within public television:

no citizen involvement
-no citizen communication or funding.

very low citizen involvement
-funding functions only,
-and/or station ascertainment survey of community needs.

low citizen involvement
-active support of PTV activities,
-and/or intermittent two-way communication with PTV hierarchy.

medium citizen involvement
-informal, on-going two-way communication with PTV hierarchy.

high citizen involvement
-formal advisory roles in policymaking, programming.

very high citizen involvement
-formal active role in policymaking, program decision-making.

It should be noted that while this same scale can be applied to both individual citizen involvement and citizen group or organization involvement, it must be applied separately in evaluating the amounts of individual citizen or group involvement. The reason for this is that within a given situation, the level of citizen group involvement may be high, while the individual citizen involvement level may be low. Of course, the converse may also be true. There is no apparent relationship between the levels of individual citizen involvement and citizen group involvement.

Further, it should be emphasized that this is not an all-encompassing scale. It will be most useful as a starting point, serving as a preliminary construct to place (as accurately

as possible) levels of citizen involvement into advancing categories for purposes of clarifying further evaluation. The scale doesn't attempt to impose values on the levels of citizen involvement. That is, high citizen involvement is not inherently better than low citizen involvement. The scale was developed as merely a measurement tool.

To better understand the author's point of view on citizen involvement, one must understand the concept (not definition) of "citizen" and its implications. Compute, as if it were possible to do so, the statistical mean of "citizen" in the United States. Proceed then to visualize the results of that hypothetical computation. Varying with the reader's personal frame of reference, the visualization most likely produces images of a person of average age, income, socio-economic status within our society. Workers, keepers of households, images of people as consumers will normally come to mind.

To aid the visualization, data gathered from Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1973,[1] indicates that the composite of that "mean or average person" would be a 28 year-old white Protestant married woman living in an urban area of population over 50,000, whose family income totals around $10,930, and whose occupation is most likely a white collar clerical worker. Granted, this is not a real person but rather a composite, however it should aid to clarify where the concept of citizen is based for the purposes of this study. The point here is that most citizens more clearly approximate the "average citizen" than a citizen at the

extremes of a population.

From this perspective, citizen involvement in public television will be considered with regards to the Carnegie Commission, the CPB Board of Directors, the National Citizens Committee for Public Television, the PBS Board of Governors, the Advisory Council of National Organizations to CPB, friends of public television, the current status of community ascertainment procedures for public television stations, a survey of public television stations and the possibilities for citizen involvement as exemplified by station KVST in Los Angeles.

## II. THE CARNEGIE COMMISSION AND THE "CITIZEN"

The concept of public television was promulgated by the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television in their report issued at the start of 1967. An examination of the members of the commission, as well as what they had to say about citizen involvement is essential in gaining a better perspective on the current state of citizen involvement in public television.

The members of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television and their positions in 1967 were:

James B. Conant,
Former President,
Harvard University

Lee A. DuBridge,
President, California
Institute of Technology

Ralph Ellison,
Author

John S. Hayes,
United States
Ambassador to
Switzerland

David D. Henry,
President,
University of Illinois

Oveta Culp Hobby,
President, Houston Post

J.C. Kellam,
President, Texas
Broadcasting Corporation

Edwin H. Land,
President,
Polaroid Corporation

Joseph H. McConnell,
President,
Reynolds Metals Company

Franklin Patterson,
President,
Hampshire College

Terry Sanford,
Former Governor,
North Carolina

Robert Saudek,
Robert Saudek
Associates, Inc.

Rudolf Serkin,
Concert Pianist

Leonard Woodcock,
Vice President,
United Automobile
Workers of America

James R. Killian, Jr.,
Chairman
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Chairman of the Commission[2]

Compute as above, the hypothetical mean of a member of the Carnegie Commission. Compare this hypothetical "average" member to the "average" citizen computed in the preceding section. Realistically, the hypothetical means of the groups should be nowhere near the same. The Carnegie Commission, a group comprised of corporation presidents, university presidents, government officials and other notable persons, obviously does not constitute a fair representation of the "average citizen."

For example, Commission Chairman James R. Killian, Jr. has held high governmental and industry positions for many years. Killian is Chairman of the Board of the Mitre Corporation, a company which develops ballistic missiles and nuclear submarines. Killian was also Chairman of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, which oversees CIA operations. Killian has also been a Director with General Motors, AT&T and the Polaroid Corporation.[3]

The only woman on the Commission, Oveta Culp Hobby, is in addition to being President and Chairman of the Houston Post Corporation, a former Director of the Women's Army Air Corps and Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. She is also a Director of the General Foods Corporation and the General Aniline and Film Corporation.

Many persons who have studied the formulation of the Carnegie Commission Report may consider the composition of

the Commission a problem of no major consequence, claiming that the Commission staff members did most of the work leading to the report and recommendations of the Commission. This claim only intensifies the absurdity of having a Commission comprised of distinguished upper-class members of our society. In a sense, considering the work of staff members Hyman Goldin, Stephen White and Gregory Harney,[4] the Commission could have been comprised of more "average citizens" and still arrived at a similar report and recommendations. While the sincerity of the Commission members is not to be questioned, their cumulative expertise in the area of educational television could have easily been matched and surpassed by a group of more representative, but less notable citizens. Granted, however, is the fact that the "names" on the Commission added considerable strength and weight to the following report.

None of the twelve recommendations of the Carnegie Commission concern themselves with citizen involvement, a topic the report as a whole seemingly overlooked. Recommendation number two, concerning the formation of a Corporation for Public Television does, however, "propose that the Corporation be governed by a board of directors of twelve distinguished and public-spirited citizens, of whom six will be initially appointed by the President of the United States with the concurrence of the Senate, and the remaining six initially elected by those previously appointed."[5] Somewhere along the line in educational television the idea was accepted that a distinguished administrative group is the best kind you can have. This, of course,

does not necessarily logically follow. A distinguished group (e.g., well known to the public and government) will inevitably have conflict of interests and limitations on the amount of time they can devote to bettering public television. A full time, more competent, but less distinguished board should be able to consistently do a better job in serving the public needs.

## III. THE CPB BOARD AND THE "CITIZEN"

The Carnegie Commission Report led to the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 and the subsequent formulation of CPB. Here too, the citizen was overlooked. Basically the Senators and Congressmen drafting the bill, felt that in the passage of the Public Broadcasting Act something good was being done for the public. The fact that the public was never really involved in the process didn't seem to bother anyone.

The hearings for the bill in both the House and the Senate overlook the matter of citizen involvement in favor of the more standard legislative considerations. In the Act itself, the only mention of citizens is again with reference to the composition of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. The Act called for the formulation of a bi-partisan board of fifteen members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.[6] In addition:

> The members of the Board shall be selected from among citizens of the United States (not regular full-time employees of the United States) who are eminent in such fields as education, cultural and civic affairs, or the arts, including radio and television and shall be selected so as to provide as nearly as practicable a broad representation of various regions of the country, various professions and occupations, and various kinds of talent and experience appropriate to the functions and responsibilities of the Corporation.[7]

The Act once again calls for "eminent" people to serve on the Board, and is further complicated by the problems inherent in political appointments. The Act does however make the requirement that members be from "such fields as education, cultural

and civic affairs or the arts. . . ." This provision, however, has not been followed strictly, and admittedly would be difficult to enforce. As a result, the CPB Board of Directors has emerged with a heavy representation of top-ranking corporate executives and former government appointees.

The first Chairman of the Board was Frank Pace, Jr., originally a government attorney who worked his way up to Secretary of the Army under President Truman. After this, Pace became Chairman of the Board, Chief Executive Officer, and Director of the General Dynamics Corporation, a company whose chief source of revenue comes from government armament contracts. The Network Project remarks about Pace's qualifications for the CPB position:

> Under Pace's Chairmanship, General Dynamics' Convair Division alone has lost $400 million--a fact which led I.F. Stone to remark that Pace's chief qualification for the job was that he knew his way around Washington.[3]

Pace, too, has served as Director of no less than eight large corporations (e.g., Time, Inc., American Fidelity Life Insurance, Colgate-Palmolive Company, Continental Oil), as well as holding top level positions in many other businesses. Pace is still a member of the CPB Board, but no longer the Chairman. Perhaps, among other things, Pace found that he was too busy to assume the duties of the Chairmanship any longer.

James R. Killian, Jr. and Oveta Culp Hobby, members of the Carnegie Commission, were appointed to the original CPB Board. Hobby's term expired and was not reappointed, but Killian is the present Chairman of the CPB Board.

John Macy, Jr., the first President of CPB, had been a high ranking government employee on both the military and civilian levels for many years. He had served as Executive Director of the United States Civil Service, and had prior to his appointment "acted as President Johnson's principal recruitee for positions at the highest levels of government."[9]

Other notable original appointees to the CPB Board included Milton S. Eisenhower and John D. Rockefeller III. While Eisenhower and Rockefeller no longer are serving on the Board, the present Board consists of a most distinguished group.

CPB Board Vice-Chairman Robert S. Benjamin is Chairman of the Board of the United Artists Corporation and Director of the Transamerica Corporation. Board member Albert Cole is the Chairman of the Board of the Reader's Digest Association. Neal B. Freeman is a vice-president and editor of the King Features division of the Hearst Corporation and Director of National Review, Inc. Michael A. Gammino, Jr. is the Chairman and President of the Columbus National Bank of Rhose Island and Chairman of the Gammimo Construction Company. Joseph D. Hughes is the Governor-Vice-President and General Counsel for T. Mellon & Sons. Thomas W. Moore is a former President of the ABC Television Network and presently President of Tomorrow Entertainment Inc., which is a subsidiary of General Electric. Frank E. Schooley is Director of Broadcasting at the University of Illinois and Manager of Will(AM-FM-TV). Jack Valenti is a partner in an advertising agency, President of the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc. and the Association of Motion Picture and

Television Producers, Inc. Jack Wrather is the President of the Evansville Refining Company, the Overton Refining Corporation, the Amarillo Producers and Refiners Corporation and Wrather Television Productions, and is also a Director of TelePrompTer Corporation, Capitol Records and others. Wrather is part owner of KNEW-TV in New York, and complete owner of KOTY-TV in Tulsa, KFMB-TV in San Diego and a few radio stations.

All the members of the Board of Directors of CPB have many committments other than those listed above. Again the point is made that the members of the Board of Directors of CPB don't fit into anyone's concept of the "average citizen." The Network Project points out the very obvious problems involved here and summarizes the consequences:

> It should come as no surprise that the CPB's Board of Directors, composed of political appointees recruited from the highest levels of military, industrial, and governmental bureaucracies, closely resembles in character the directorates of other closed, private American corporations. Whether "public" television, controlled by an organization whose membership is weighted so preponderantly in favor of the ruling Establishment, can truly serve the "public interest, convenience, and necessity" is, however, another matter entirely.[10]

## IV. THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE AND THE "CITIZEN"

In May 1967 a "citizens" group was being formed to support public television. The organization, called the National Citizens Committee for Public Television (NCCPTV), was funded initially by $250,000 in grants from the Dansforth, Kellogg, Sloan and Ford Foundations, the Twentieth Century Fund and the Carnegie Corporation.[11] The Committee was formed by Thomas P.F. Hoving, author Ralph Ellison (of the Carnegie Commission), Newton N. Minow (former FCC chairman) and ETV officials Devereix C. Josephs and Ralph Lowell.

Thomas Hoving chaired the "citizens" group. Hoving is the Director of the New York Metropolitan Museum of Art. He is also a Director of the IBM World Trade Corporation, the Hartford Trust Company and the New York Plaza Hotel Corporation. The membership of NCCPTV in 1967 was small but growing. A report in Broadcasting said:

> The addition of 58 prominent Americans to the National Citizens Committee for Public Television last week brings its total membership to 110.[12]

Only in public television could you have a "citizens" group comprised of "prominent Americans."

NCCPTV was never to become a very influential group in public television. Certainly, it never became truly a "citizens" group. It was understandable that when public television was just getting off the ground no one wanted to criticize the new baby learning how to walk. Thus, the white paper issued at the

first full membership meeting of NCCPTV chose to ignore the problems developing in public television by issuing a soft-line report similar to a public relations release supporting public television.[13]

In 1969, at a time when a truly effective citizens organization for public television was becoming needed, NCCPTV changed the focus and name of the organization. NCCPTV became the National Citizens Committee for Television and broadened the issues it wished to concern itself with outside the specific area of public television.

## V. THE PBS BOARD AND THE "CITIZEN"

When a Board of Directors was organized for PBS in 1969 its total membership of nine consisted of five ETV station managers, two Institutional Directors (CPB, NET), and two Public Directors (characteristically Chairmen of local ETV station boards).[14] The lack of public represenatation (two versus a total of seven others) stemmed primarily from the problems PBL had in the past with their editorial advisory board.[15]

The PBL Editorial Advisory Board had a history of conflicts and problems with the PBL operating staff, and has often been mentioned as one of the primary reasons PBL never lived up to expectations. The Editorial Advisory Board consisted of "lay" (although highly distinguished and elderly) members supposedly representing the public. Being aware of the PBL experience, a feeling developed at PBS that a preponderance of lay board members would be more trouble than it was worth.

Eventually, the composition of the PBS Board changed to include more representatives in the form of Public Directors. However, the first change in the PBS Board composition in April 1970 showed a decline in representation of Public Directors. At that time the total Board membership numbered eleven, with the breakdown including six Station Directors, two Public Directors, two Institutional Directors and the President of PBS.

The next change came in May 1972 when the total membership of the Board was increased to nineteen. This included twelve

Station Directors, six Public Directors and the President of PBS. Equality came in practice to the Board members representing the public in March 1973. At that time the composition of the overall Board was changed to include fifteen members on a Board of Managers (PTV professional representatives) and fifteen members on the Board of Governors (the lay representatives). This last change,however, existed in theory only, in that the Board of Directors at that time actually existed of a twenty-five member initial Board of Governors and a twenty-one member Board of Managers. This led to the development of the present composition scheme for the Board of Directors which was formulated in November 1973. This called for the overall Board to consist of a twenty-five member Board of Governors and a twenty-five member Board of Managers.

The twenty-five member Board of Governors is a lay board representing the public. In actuality, the members are the Chairmen of the Board of their local PTV stations and are from similar backgrounds as the CPB Board members.

Ralph Rogers, Chairman of the Board of PBS (Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Texas Industries), summed up the situation well in his introduction of the Board of Governors to the Senate Sucbommittee on Communications on March 29, 1973. Mr. Rogers' introduction places the citizens' lack of involvement in the hierarchy of public television in a proper perspective. Rogers said:

> Mr. Chairman, with your permission, yesterday you had before you a distinguished board of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Today you have had introduced

> to you distinguished boards of directors of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, Educational Television Stations Division, and the Public Broadcasting Service, but there is a new player in the game for the first time today, and it is the Board of Governors of Public Television, a lay board. I submit to you, and I won't take the time to introduce every person individually, but I submit to you that this is one of the most distinguished boards with which you have ever been faced. . . .[16]

As some examples of the membership shows, the Board is indeed a distinguished group in the same basic establishment patterns as the previously mentioned boards. Board of Governors member M.M. Anderson is a Director of the Aluminum Company of America. Edmund F. Ball is Chairman of the Muncie Aviation Corporation, and a Director of the American National Bank & Trust Company and the Muncie Borg-Warner Corporation. Mrs. Edward N. Cole's husband is the President and Chief Operating Officer of the General Motors Corporation. William C. Friday is the President of the University of North Carolina. James Harlow is the President of West Virginia University. Ethan A. Hitchcock is the Chairman of the Board of the Olivetti Corporation of America. Newton N. Minow was formerly chairman of the FCC. Donald R. McNeil is the Chancellor of the University of Maine. William B. Quarton is the Chairman of the Board of three CATV companies, the President of WMT-TV Inc. in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Leonard H. Rosenberg is the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Chesapeake Life Insurance Company. John Schwada is the President of Arizona State University.

Referring back to the hypothetical "mean of average citizen" concept developed earlier, it would seem fairly obvious that this concept of "citizen" is getting little or no representation on

the Boards of CPB or PBS. CPB and PBS seem secure in knowing, as Ralph Rogers' comment points out, that their boards consist of truly distinguished people. Somehow, that really doesn't seem so important.

## VI. ACNO

There are some organized efforts being made towards citizen involvement in public television. The official CPB position on citizen involvement was described in a personal letter from Ms. Sara G. Frederickson, Assistant Director, Office of Volunteer Activities at CPB:

> The Corporation has gone on record in support of citizen involvement and in 1969 established an advisory group of national organizations to provide public input into CPB activities.[17]

The group, the Advisory Council of National Organizations (ACNO) concerns itself with what can be more easily conceived of as approaching a legitimate form of citizen involvement in public television. In the 1973 Annual Report, CPB states:

> The goals of ACNO are to provide national support for the mission and goals of public radio and television at the national policy and programming level; and activation of support of local public radio and television stations by the members of national organizations in their home towns. . . . Increased liaison with the CPB Board was a key to the development of ACNO in 1973. At the Board's request ACNO developed a draft statement of mission and goals for public broadcasting. It began studies regarding objectivity and balance, foreign product acquisitions, and the proposed syndication plan.[18]

Each ACNO delegate representa a national organization and helps the Council serve in a general advisory capacity to the CPB Board, as well as aiding in the evaluation of specific programs and programming policy. At present, ACNO consists of 49 member organizations. Examples of groups represented include the American Jewish Committee, the National Catholic Education Association, and the U.S. National Student Association.

ACNO is a council with standing committees in Education, Community Outreach, Public Policy, Programming, and Membership and Nominations. Subcommittees are formed to assist in advisory policymaking in special interest areas. The subcommittees are made up of non-ACNOmembers with expertise in the specified subject area. Individuals serving on the subcommittees can be financed by CPB (put on the CPB payroll as consultants to the Director of Citizen Services).

There are a few barriers to true citizen involvement that an organization like ACNO predicates. First of all, it is an organization made up primarily of long-standing and establishment oriented national organizations. For example, a basic criterion for ACNO memberships calls for the organization to have "regular two-way communication with state or local leadership."[19] This requirement has built-in problems in terms of corraborating and establishing true citizen involvement, because it by definition excludes organizations which are not already extremely credible in the eyes of the establishment. The rule would appear to exclude those who need representation the most, groups who by convention in the past have been essentially disenfranchised by virtue of lack of legitimacy. This most often will include groups on the left end of the political spectrum who have a tendency to be denied or shun away from the required "two-way communication."

Aside from these built-in limitations, ACNO is trying to develop effective ways to implement citizen involvement. An example of this is the ACNO Community Outreach Project. Public

broadcasting station managers were made aware of the project to encourage local members of the Council's organizations to become involved with the local public broadcasting stations.[20] Station managers were encouraged to take the first steps in contacting the local organizations, although the organizations on the local level were also made aware of the project. The purpose of the project was bringing about a broader base of support for the local station.

The presence and extreme visability of an organization like ACNO was probably, in part, responsible for opening the first CPB Board Meeting to the public in November 1973.[21]

ACNO forms of citizen involvement would range from low citizen involvement to high citizen involvement on the scale developed earlier. Primarily though, ACNO would fall into the low citizen involvement category, that of being primarily a support group.

## VII. FRIENDS AND "CITIZENS"

The National Friends of Public Broadcasting (NFPB) was established in July 1970 and receives its funding from the Carnegie Corporation, and the Rockefeller and Markle Foundations. Additional support for the National Friends comes from CPB.[22] The introduction in a brochure put out by the NFPB states:

> The search for community support was the genesis of the National Friends of Public Broadcasting, an organization whose purpose is to encourage the formation and act as a resource for local volunteer groups prepared to work on behalf of public broadcasting stations within their home communities. It seeks to develop local support for the local station at the local level, and through this to develop an informed constuency for public broadcasting that will serve both the station and the community.[23]

The membership of the NFPB is made up of representatives of local public broadcasting volunteer groups. A guideline to the membership composition of NFPB is that all members of the group's Board of Trustees are "Mrs." The emphasis of NFPB as a support group is public television, but there appears to be a trend to build greater support for public radio in the future. At present, NFPB notes that 104 out of 148 licensed public television licensees have an alliance with a local volunteer/support group. NFPB serves as a clearing-house for the local "friends" groups and helps new volunteer groups to get started.

The primary functions of the local "friends" groups are station support activities. The local "friends" support the local station in a number of ways. Usually with some office facilities at the local station, the "friends" group helps out

in public relations, station promotion, program promotions and most often funding promotions. Auctions have become a popular means of the local station raising funds for itself on a local basis and the local "friends" are often the initiators and organizers of the auction.

The "friends" groups' functions range greatly between communities. The range of individual "friends" groups could be placed in all of the categories developed in the scale of citizen involvement. Very rarely, it seems, does the local "friends" group step beyond its bounds as a support organization into the role of an advisor to the station. A remark by Mrs. Kenneth Haynie of the Friends of Educational Broadcasting in Iowa may be typical of local friends activities. Mrs. Haynie sees the Iowa friends group as being made up of primarily volunteers, and says that being a support group, "We just sit there quietly, and help out where we can."[24]

A great deal of the time, the "friends" organizations have chosen to act as flag wavers for public television. Waving the flag is patriotic but does it really contribute to improving the quality of life in the United States? In this sense, how much does the support of the "friends" groups really improve the quality of public television? No doubt the "friends" organizations are helping public television, but the idea that a true friend tells you the truth when you are wrong should not be forgotten.

It is proposed here that the "friends" organizations

should assert themselves more and seek out higher levels of citizen involvement and where possible assume more active roles in partial policymaking and program decisionmaking processes of the local stations. As it is now, the majority of the "friends" activities falls into the category of low citizen involvement, that is, active support of public television activities.

## VIII. ASCERTAINING COMMUNITY NEEDS

Meaningful citizen involvement calls for more than citizens becoming involved with the PTV station, it calls for the station to become involved with the public it is serving. Ascertainment is a starting point in this process. At present, public television stations are not required by the Federal Communications Commission to make an ascertainment of community problems, needs and interests in their application for renewal of broadcast licenses. Commercial stations are required to ascertain community needs in a formal way as outlined in the FCC Primer of February 23, 1971. The FCC exempted at that time educational stations from the ascertainment requirement, citing that:

> Given the reservation of channels for specialized kinds of programming, educational stations manifestly must be treated differently than commercial stations.[25]

Thus, in 1971, public television and ratio were let off the ascertainment hook, and the question became for how much longer?

Even before the ascertainment primer was issued many people were pointing out the need for public television to ascertain community needs more effectively. Ralph M. Jennings, of the Office of Communication at the United Church of Christ, had pointed out in 1970 that:

> Public Broadcasting appears to court public funding while it spurns community participation in shaping program service. Lax FCC licensing requirements for educational stations encourage the tendency of many public broadcasters to be more responsive to elitist directorship, wealthy benefactors, and politicians than to the less well situated and more needy elements of their constituencies.. . . .At a time when ETV is enjoying increased attention

> and public funding, its practitioners should no longer expect to be exempted from regulatory safeguards which insure that the public interest is served.[26]

Public television station managers at the time of the FCC Primer in 1971 were not certain of their positions on ascertainment. They were, as Sandra Williams Bennett points out, very apprehensive about the prospects of ascertaining community needs. Bennett notes that:

> Station administrators seem overwhelmed by the concept of ascertaining community needs. Rather than attacking the problem one step at a time, they tend to view it as a monumental task that appears to be insurmountable. They tend to focus on barriers and then justify their inability to confront them.[27]

With the concept of public television gaining more prominence, there has developed an increasing awareness in the shift of emphasis in educational broadcaster's programming from "instructional" to "public". With this increase in "public" programming, many observers felt that the special status given to the educational broadcasters in the 1971 Primer was becoming less and less justified. Pertaining to this, in September 1973, the FCC issued a Notice of Inquiry and Notice of Proposed Rule-making on the subject of ascertainment of community needs by educational broadcasters. The FCC, while calling for further inquiry into the subject, made clear in no uncertain terms that ascertainment of community needs was an essential task educational broadcasters must face up to. The FCC said here that:

> Even though formal ascertainment requirements have not been imposed on non-commercial broadcasters, there appears to be no question concerning their oblications in this regard--they like commercial broadcasters have an affirmative duty to determine the needs and interests of their communities and to program in such a way as to meet those ascertained needs.[28]

Only the details of a formal ascertainment procedure for educational broadcasters seems to remain. The question of whether or not a formal ascertainment procedure patterned after the commercial Primer would be most useful in evaluating the educational broadcasters must still be decided by the FCC. Many of the groups (including CPB) filing comments to the FCC on the matter of ascertainment have felt that the educational broadcasters have a duty to ascertain community needs to even a finer degree than is required of commercial broadcasters. The claim here is that because of federal funding and station reservations, the public broadcaster should have to be more accountable to the public and be more aware of how to meet the public's needs.

Many public broadcasters, in anticipation of the almost inevitable ascertainment requirements of the future, have begun to attempt ascertainment by many methods. Some public broadcasters have chosen to approximate the ascertainment procedures outlined in the commercial Primer . The commercial Primer calls for ascertainment in two areas: (1) consultations with community leaders, and (2) consultations with members of the general public. Preliminary ascertainment procedures would seem to indicate that public broadcasters have often initiated consultations with community leaders, rather than consulting a random sample of members of the general public (see survey).

There certainly is a need for ascertainment of community needs by public broadcasters. The need is there for the ascertainment process to expand beyond a basic requirement for license renewal. The need of the public to be better served

by public television calls for ascertainment of community needs to be an ongoing process. The process--active ascertainment--calls for the community involvement all public broadcasters should be anxious to initiate. A broadcaster who knows the public being served should be at a better starting point in being able to answer community needs and activate more meaningful citizen involvement.

## IX. SURVEY OF PTV STATIONS

A preliminary survey (see Appendix) of public television stations was conducted to initiate an assessment of citizen involvement. The survey was conducted in October and the first two weeks in November 1974. Questionnaires were sent to the general managers of thirty selected public television stations. The thirty selected stations were broken down into a representation of ten community stations, ten university stations, five state stations and five school stations. The survey sought to get at issues of citizen involvement in the areas of (1) financing, (2) programming, and (3) policy-making.

The sample at the start was biased. The stations receiving questionnaires were selected not on a random basis, but rather the basis of selection was centered on the station being solidly established. Stations selected had been in existence a minumum of five years, and were considered to be "strong" public television stations. In other words, the stations selected were essentially thought to be the cream of the crop. The reasoning for selecting these stations was based on the assumption that the better established public television stations were more likely to have a higher level of citizen involvement. It was assumed that newly established PTV stations, and those which act primarily as translators would be less likely to have initiated programs for citizen invovement.

While exploratory in nature and not initially designed with

an eye towards statistical analysis, some methodological problems nevertheless plagued the relative success of the survey. The primary problem was the lack of cooperation by the PTV stations, and thus, the results are doubly biased by the methodological problem of having a low rate of return on an already small sample size. As of November 14, 1974, only eighteen of the thirty questionnaires were returned. Of these eighteen returned, five were community stations, six university stations, all five school stations and two state stations. The rate of return was only 60% a level too low to draw any accurate inference from. A general unwillingness to cooperate with the survey was further indicated on the returned questionnaires by fully and partially incomplete questionnaires and incomplete answers to the individual questions. Although a sample program schedule was requested from each of the stations in a cover letter, only six program schedules were received. A copy of ascertainment surveys was requested of those stations which had conducted ascertainment studies. Of the nine stations which responded that they had conducted ascertainment surveys, only three forwarded the results. Two stations, KQED (San Francisco, community), and WETA (Washington, D.C., community) said that their ascertainment surveys were much too large to be send through the mail but were available for public inspection at the station.

Another methodological problem came about as a result of the questionnaire design. While the questionnaire served its purposes in aiding an exploratory survey to reach some bases

on which generalizations can be made, the results of a survey using a format of open-ended questions can not reliably go past this initial stage. The survey's built-in problems stemmed primarily from the fact that no one else had even ventured into the initial stages, therby leaving no basis on which to develop a more meaningful survey at that time.

The results of the survey are obviously nowhere near conclusive, however, the answers to the questionnaire provide insights into the very best and the very worst stations in terms of bringing about citizen involvement. An assumption can be made that the bias of the survey, with regards to the low rate of return, would tend to point to a higher level of citizen involvement than is really there. That is, those stations which would likely have little or no citizen involvement would be unlikely to return the questionnaire. In any case, the results provide some interesting insights as to the quality of citizen involvement. In the following paragraphs, specific questions from the survey will be considered.

Number of station employees. The number of station employees ranged from 460 at WNET (New York City, community) to twenty-two as WSPS, (Spokane, Wash., school). There seems to be a trend for the larger stations to have conducted ascertainment surveys. There appeared to be no correlation between the size of the station in terms of number of station employees and the likelihood of the station having a "friends" organization.

How is your station's governing board selected? For the most part, station's governing board's were political appointments of various kinds. . ."Self-perpetuating" boards were also common (i.e., WNET, WGBH, KTCA). Two methods of selecting boards of directors came closest to the public. In Nebraska, the governing board of KUON (Lincoln, university) is composed of the Regents of the University of Nebraska who are elected by the people of the state. The Board of KSPS (Spokane, Wash., school) is elected by the KSPS Patron's which is the station's "friends" group. However, this KSPG Board was said to have no direct relation to the operation of the station.

Who are the present members and what are their professional backgrounds? As was expected, the boards of directors at the local stations were composed of persons of upper income level professional positions. The number of members on a given board varied markedly from station to station. Only five members were on the board at KSPS (Spokane, school) while 36 members were on the board at WETA (Washington, D.C., community). Women were noticable absent or in the minority on the boards. The more baffling responses to this question include WETV (Atlanta, school) which answered that they have no board of directors. WSIU (Carbondale, Ill., university) claimed that a compilation of their board of directors was "N/A" (not available). One could almost be certain that if the FCC or HEW was making the inquiry, a board of directors would somehow materialize.

What are the board's duties with regards to station policy and/or operation? The answers to this question fell primarily

into three basic categories. By far the most frequent answer was that the board sets the policy for the station. Second to this, answers cited that the board serves in primarily an advisory capacity. Thirdly, the role of the board was cited as being primarily a fiscal responsibility.

How often does the board meet to consider station business? The answers to this question ran the gamut from the board at WHA (Madison, Wisc., university) meeting "directly--rarely" to the board as KSPS (Spokane, school) meeting every two weeks. A substantial number of boards met bi-monthly or quarterly, and the same number of boards met monthly.

Can the public attend and/or participate at these meetings? Most of the board meetings were open to the public for attendence. The actual amount of participation could not be determined from the frequently occurring "yes" answer. Only three stations responded that the public could not attend the board meetings. Station KTCA (St. Paul-Minneapolis, Minn., community) answered that "it can attend, it does not participate." WETA (Washington, D.C., community) answered, "Public is not invited, but would not be refused admission." These answers indicate that the question has been overlooked by the stations. Since open board meetings where the public can participate should be a minimum starting point for citizen access to public television, the lack of consideration would seem unfortunate.

Is there a local citizen's group or "friends" organization affiliated with your station? The responses to this question were highly varied, most answers indicating that the station's

manager didn't really know very much about the "friends" organizations. Most often the organizations were characterized as being volunteer women's groups. The most humorous response to this question came from John C. Schwarzwalder at KTCA (St. Paul-Minneapolis, community) who said the "friends" group was "composed of a dozen women who say they want to help and very seldom do so."

To what extent is this "friends" group involved in station policy and/or operation? Most consistently the response to this question indicated that the "friends" groups were not involved at all in station policy or operation. Two of the stations noted that the "friends" served in an advisory role with regards to selection of programming.

Are the "friends" primarily involved in fund raising? The answers here were almost equally divided between yes and no. When a yes answer was given, usually attached to it was a note that the "friends" help to promote the station. When a no answer was given, station promotion again was cited as being a function of the friends. Again the most amusing answer to the question went to KTCA's Schwarzwalder, who said, "No-they don't do that either."

How much of your station financial support comes from individual subscriptions and donations (including auctions) and what percentage of your total budget does this represent? The answers to this question seemed to be highly questionable. The answers demonstrated an apparent lack of understanding of the question. The problem with this is that the answers did not

consistently answer the question with regards to the "total budget" but often used other measuring sticks such as "local budget" or "unrestricted budget." As accurately as possible under the circumstances, the percentage of support which comes from individual subscriptions and donations ranges from "very insignificant amount" or "less than 1%" to a highly questionable "50%" at KQED (San Francisco, community). The mean of most reported percentages would seem to total in at being around 10% of the total budget.

Has your station ever conducted a community ascertainment survey? Of the fifteen responses to this question, nine of the stations said they had conducted ascertainment surveys. Of the three examples of ascertainment surveys which were forwarded, the WHA(Madison, Wisc., university) survey was the only one attempting to ascertain community needs and problems. Of the other two surveys, the KDIN (Des Moines, Iowa, state) was the better, and did in fact contain a question pertaining to community needs. The KTCA (St. Paul-Minneapolis, community) survey was the worst, ignoring investigation of community needs. Both the WHA and KTCA surveys were developed by University of Wisconsin graduate students. The KDIN survey was developed by the Opinion Research Corporation. It is likely that only the WHA survey would meet the requirements as laid out in the FCC Primer as designed for commercial stations. The other surveys are more concerned with programming feedback. Of the three surveys, the KDIN survey would seem to be the most methodologically sound, the WHA survey was fairly sound, and the KTCA survey was a disaster

in its misuse of inferential statistics. For example, the WHA mail questionnaire rate of return was only eight per cent. In addition, WHA used group meetings to ascertain community needs. At those meetings, only 37 out of the 300 invited participants attended. Fortunately, the WHA survey also included the results of consultations with community leaders and 305 completed telephone questionnaires. The KTCA survey used a mail questionnaire and considered its 45% return ratio very, very successful. Of course, a 45% return ratio is relatively useless in any application of statistical inference. Only the KDIN survey uses a large enough unbaised sample and can assure a 95% confidence level in its results.

How has your station incorporated the results of the ascertainment survey in its programming policies? Illogical as it may seem, the most common answer to this "how" question was "yes". Only one of the respondents answering the question beyond the obligatory "yes" indicated how the survey was actually applied to what programming policies would be. Station manager Otto Schlaak of WMVS (Milwaukee, school) wrote that:

> From our ascertainment procedure and process we selected five areas which we felt could be most effectively dealt with during the license period. These areas were designated as major program emphasis areas. During a week long retreat station executives invited individuals to a "think tank" environment and spent one day brainstorming each area--then the producers, working for the station, devised a campaign-programming strategy for each area, at this point producer/directors were called in to develop programming. Later the programming department scheduled the programs (in cooperation with a concerted promotion campaign). Post testing is done to measure audience levels and attitudinal and community change that may have resulted from the programming effort.

Some generalizations can be made on the results of the survey. Station Boards of Directors are composed of an elite group when compared with the concept of "average citizen" developed earlier. The boards from the majority of the stations are actively involved in policymaking for the station. Boards meet most often on a monthly or bi-monthly basis. The public can attend the Board meetings, but it is often unclear to what extent the public is allowed to participate. "Friends" groups are established at a majority of stations and serve primarily in the station promotion role, although their fund raising functions were also considered important. Financial support from individual subscriptions and donations varies greatly from station to station. A majority of stations have attempted ascertainment surveys. The quality of the ascertainment studies is highly suspect. Stations say they have incorporated the results of the ascertainment survey in its programming policies, but are hard pressed to pinpoint exactly how this was accomplished.

As a whole, the survey helped to gain an assessment of what station administrators' concepts of citizen involvement are, and should aid in the development of a survey which could be more useful in the assessment of citizen involvement in public television.

The survey also pointed out the need for any subsequent surveys to be supported by an official PTV organization in order that it carry the weight needed to insure the almost complete response needed for a more accurate analysis. Such a

survey sent out on the CPB or PBS letterhead would be guaranteed a much higher rate of return than the original survey run here received. The tendency seems to be for station managers to pay inadequate attention to any inquiry coming from an unofficial source, in that there is no real need to comply with the inquiries' requests.

## X. KVST'S CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

Positive steps were taken in the direction of more effective citizen involvement as station KVST in Los Angeles initiated a new concept of public television. The concept revolves around the PTV station encouraging and initiating individual citizen and community involvement. KVST, the call letters signifying "Viewer Sponsored Television," began on-air operation in April 1974 as the third educational channel in the Los Angeles market.[29]

The formation of KVST is based on a policy of facilitating social change. In establishing its general programming objectives, KVST has proposed:

> To act as a supportive service for organizations and individuals that are on the cutting edge of problem solving by providing exciting examples of successful problem solving efforts and relating these examples to actions that are currently in progress. The emphasis on problem solving is part of a conscious effort to inspire and motivate the citizenry to overcome a sense of impotence and alienation and get involved in viable means of improving their condition of life. Involvement refers primarily to involvement with action organizations and secondarily with the station itself.[30]

In effect, the station is to serve as a focal point in the origination of community problem solving. The station's programming is almost exclusively in the area of public affairs and a sustantial portion of that is locally produced.

The management of the station was successful in raising over $1,000,000 in support which was needed prior to the first program airing.[31] The concept of viewer sponsored television is catching on slowly, and KVST has been expanding the number of

programming hours since its inception. Broadcasting now a total of six hours daily, the station is plagued by financial troubles which find the present recession in the economy as its base.

Funding based on primarily viewer sponsorship is highly susceptible to fluctuations in the economy. Subscription rates offered by the station fall into three categories: (1) standard membership at $25 a year, (2) student and senior citizen membership at $12 a year, and (3) poverty community membership at $2.50 a year.[32] The inclusion of this last category of membership certainly must be a first in public television and would seem to be a sensible idea for any PTV station trying to widen its constituency.

The KVST Board of Directors is elected by the viewer sponsors and is composed of members of community and minority groups involved in problem solving. KVST General Manager Clinton Stouffer has said, "We don't put people on our board because of their donations. They have to be socially concerned media professionals and people already active in community problem-solving."[33]

KVST's approach to choosing a board of directors would seem to markedly contrast with the approaches used by other PTV stations. KVST also encourages volunteers at the station and offers a training program twice a week in techniques of television production. The station has been attempting to generate program production from within the community for broadcast.[34]

The name of the game at KVST seems to be access. Being the first station of its kind, KVST will be considered by many to be an experiment. If it somehow works, the prospects for increased citizen involvement in public television would seem greatly enhanced.

## XI. CONCLUSION

The democratic guarantee that "the airwaves belong to the people," has been empty rhetoric from the start in the face of the big media business. The history of commercial television in the United States has made this point very clear. Public television had a chance to rectify the problems of limited public access to broadcast media. Most obviously, that opportunity was not even considered by the formulators of public television.

The Carnegie Commission from the start was big media business. The formulation of CPB and PBS with their respective boards of directors intensified the feeling that public television was big media business parallel to anything commercial television could offer. Boards of directors from the commercial networks were made up of persons remarkably similar to those making up the boards at CPB and PBS. The bureauracy of public television grew, and as is the case in large bureaucracies, the voice of the public became fainter and fainter. Given such a situation, citizen involvement is a difficult process to initiate.

The National Citizens Committee for Public Television was the initial attempt at making the public's voice heard. However, NCCPTV chose to be a quiet organization made up of remarkably "prominent" citizens, and then eventually lost interest in devoting its efforts to only public television. CPB's ACNO was formed in 1969 and has attempted some positive programs in

initiating organizational involvement with local PTV stations. The nature of ACTO membership, however, leaves large segments of the population without official organizational representation to public television management. The National Friends of Public Television and the local "friends" organizations are apparently in a dilemma of definition (or really can't decide what it is they should be or could be doing). Although "friends" groups vary widely from community to community, the composition of the organizations consistently conflicts with the concept of "average citizen."

Present ascertainment processes of public television stations seem rather useless. The hope for the future, in terms the stations initiating more citizen involvement, is that the FCC proposes an ascertainment process which will not leave the public neglected. Ascertainment of community needs must become an ongoing process of station involvement in the community to have any effect on the consequent levels of citizen involvement. A good ascertainment procedure can brighten the prospects for a higher level of citizen involvement.

As it is, consideration of citizen involvement by public television officials remains an "after the fact" consideration to be dealt with in a quiet, efficient way. The only apparent exception to this proposition is in the case study of the development of KVST in Los Angeles. Success at KVST may encourage groups in other cities to attempt viewer sponsored public television stations.

In summation, the level of citizen involvement in public television is discouragingly low. What is even more discouraging is the low level of awareness that citizen involvement is an important consideration in the operation of a public television station.

# APPENDIX

PLEASE RETURN TO: Lawrence Wenner
TV Center
Old Armory
The University
of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa
52240

Station_____

Individual completing questionnaire_____
(name) (title)

Type of station(community, school, etc.)_____

Number of station employees_____

National and Regional network affiliation(s)_____

How is your station's governing board selected?

Who are the present members and what are their professional backgrounds?

What are the board's duties with regards to station policy and/or operation?

How often does the board meet to consider station business?

Can the public attend and/or participate at these meetings?

Is there a local citizen's group or "friends" organization affiliated with your station?

If yes:

What is the composition, structure and duties of this organization?

To what extent is this "friends" group involved in station policy and/or operation?

Are the "friends" primarily involved in fund raising?

How much of your station financial support comes from indivdual subscriptions and donations (including auctions) and what percentage of your total budget does this represent?

Has your station ever conducted a community ascertainment survey?

If you have:
I would appreciate you forwarding a copy of your most recent survey.

How has your station incorporated the results of the ascertainment survey in its programming policies?

Thank you for your cooperation on this survey.

FOOTNOTES

[1]U.S., Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States; 1973 (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1973).

[2]Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, Public Television: A Program for Action (New York: Harper & Row, 1967). rear book jacket.

[3]All biographical information in this paper has been compiled from Standard & Poor's Register of Corporations, Directors and Executives: United States and Canada: 1974, 2 vols. (New York: Standard & Poors, 1974): and Who's Who in America: 1974-75, 2 vols. (Chicago: Marquis Who's Who, Inc., 1974).

[4]John E. Burke, "The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967: Part I: Historical Origins and the Carnegie Commission," Educational Broadcasting Review 6 (April 1972): 119.

[5]Carnegie Commission, Public Television, p. 37.

[6]Public Broadcasting Act, 81 Stat. 369 (1967).

[7]Ibid.

[8]Network Project, The Fourth Network (New York: Network Project, 1971), p. 18.

[9]Ibid., p. 20.

[10]Ibid., p. 27.

[11]"Membership doubled in Hoving's PTV committee," Broadcasting, 4 December 1967, p. 36.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Les Brown, "White Paper Has That Blank Look," Variety, 14 February 1968, p. 29.

[14]The information to this and following sections pertaining to the changing composition of the PBS Board comes from what will be called: "PBS Internal Document," 8 January 1974.

[15]Les Brown, "PBL's Own Generation Gap," Variety, 15 November 1967, p. 27/

[16]U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Commerce, Public Broadcasting, Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on Commerce, 93d Cong., 1st Sess., 1973, p. 117.

[17]Sara G. Frederickson, personal letter, 29 October 1974.

[18]Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Annual Report 73 (Washington D.C.: CPB, 1974), p. 20.

[19]Advisory Council of National Organizations, "ACNO Handbook," Washington, D.C., 1974, p. 3 (Offset.).

[20]CPB, Untitled form letter concerning Community Outreach to public broadcasting station managers, n.d.

[21]"Public Broadcasting to Open a Meeting," New York Times, 16 October 1973, p. 87.

[22]NFPB, "National Friends of Public Broadcasting," New York, 1974. (PR Booklet.)

[23]Ibid.

[24]Telephone interview with Mrs. Kenneth H Haynie, NFPB Board of Trustees member, 1 November 1974.

[25]U.S., Federal Communications Commission, Federal Communications Commission Reports 27 FCC 2d Report and Order in the Matter of Primer on Ascertainment of Community Problems by Broadcast Applicants, Docket No. 18774 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 651.

[26]Ralph M. Jennings, "PTV Needs Responsiveness to the Community," Educational Television, July 1970, p. 4.

[27]Sandra Bennett Williams, Ascertainment of Community Needs by Public Television Stations: A Study of KPBS, WOSU, WVIZ, WETA, and the Alabama Educational Television Commission (Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1971; Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 72-4421, 1971).

[28]U.S., Federal Communications Commission, Notice of Inquiry and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 73-930. In the Matter of Ascertainment of Community Problems by Educational Broadcast Applicants, Docket No. 19816, 19 February 1973, par. 8,

[29]KVST, "Nation's First Social Change Oriented Public Television Station," Los Angeles, n.d. (Offset.)

[30]KVST, "KVST-TV's Primary Programming Objective and Policies," Los Angeles, n.d. (Offset.)

[31]Dick Adler, "$40,000 to Air Time for LA.A's 2nd PBS Station," Los Angeles Times, 17 December 1973, part IV, p. 1.

[32]KVST, "Nation's First Social Change Oriented Public Television Station," Los Angeles, n.d. (Offset.)

[33]Adler, "$40,000," LAT, p. 1.

[34]KVST, "Channel 68/KVST-TV, Questions and Answers." Los Angeles, 1974. (Offset.)

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Published Materials


Adler, Dick. "$40,000 to Air Time for L.S.'s 2nd PBS Station." Los Angeles Times, 17 December 1973, sec. f, p. 1.

Brown, Les. "PBL's Own Generation Gap." Variety, 15 November 1967, p. 27.

_____, "White Paper Has That Blank Look." Variety, 14 February 1968, p. 29.

Bennett, Sandra Williams. Ascertainment of Community Needs by Public Television Stations: A Study of KPBS, WOSU, WVIZ, WETA, and the Alabama Educational Television Commission. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1971: Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 72-4421, 1971.

Burke, John E. "The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967: Part II: Historical Origins and the Carnegie Commission." Educational Broadcasting Review 6(April 1972): 119.

Carnegie Commission on Educational Television. Public Television: A Program for Action. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Annual Report 73. Washington, D.C.: CPB, 1974.

Foley, Joseph M. "Ascertaining Ascertainment: Impact of the FCC Primer on TV Renewal Applications." Journal of Broadcasting 16 (Fall 1972): 387-406.

Greeley, Bill. "PBL Folds Old School Tie." Variety, 24 April 1968, p. 35.

_____, "PBL Advisory Bd. Calls for Ouster of Westin, Urgers Radical Shifts." Variety, 22 May 1968, p. 29.

_____, "PBL Gets 'Renewal,' But Auspices, Leadership & Format All Are 'Iffy'." Variety, 29 May 1968.

"A Hot Campaign to Interest Public in Publit TV." Broadcasting, 28 January 1974, pp. 36-37.

Jennings, Ralph M., et.al. Public Television Station Employment Practices and the Composition of Boards of Directors: The Status of Minorities and Women. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 074 742, 1973.

_____, "PTV Needs Responsiveness to the Community." Educational Television, July 1970, p. 4.

Johnson, Nicholas. "The Why of Public Television." Educational Broadcasting Review 1 (December 1967) :5-10.

Krasnow, Erwin G., and Quale, John C. "Ascertainment: The Quest for the Holy Grail." Public Telecommunications Review 2 (June 1974) : 6-13.

"KVST/TV Channel 68, Has Been Broadcasting for 4 Weeks." Los Angeles Times. 31 May 1974, sec. 4, p. 1.

"LA Council Defeat of Plan for LA Probe of KVST Eyed." Los Angeles Times, 9 April 1974, sec. 2, p. 6.

"LA Council Okays $50,000 Gift to KVST TV." Los Angeles Times. 10 April 1974, sec. 2, p. 1.

"LA Council Reverses Approval of KVST Funding." Los Angeles Times, 5 April 1974, sec. 2, p. 8.

"LA Council Votes to Give $50,000 to KVST TV." Los Angeles Times, 4 April 1974, sec. 2, p. 4.

Meirhenry, W.C. Survey of Public Television Station Managers 1973. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 074 762, 1973.

Membership doubled in Hoving's PTV Committee." Broadcasting, 4 December 1967, p. 36.

Miller, Leroy. Public Television: How Our Users See Us. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 055 418, 1971.

Network Project. The Fourth Network. New York: Network Project 1971.

"PBL Editorial Board's Power is Under Review." Broadcasting, 27 November 1967, p. 9.

"PBL Modifies Committee, Sets New Guidelines." Broadcasting, 7 October 1968, p. 62.

"PBL Rents NBC Facilities for Show." Broadcasting, 22 May 1967, p. 59.

"PBS Aims to Make Public Television People's Business." Broadcasting, pp. 29-30.

Public Broadcasting Act. Statutes at Large, vol. 81 (1967).

"Public Broadcasting to Open a Meeting." New York Times. 16 October 1973, p. 87.

Schramm, Wilbur, and Nelson, Lyle. The Financing of Public Television. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service. ED 067 891, 1972.

Standard & Poor's Register of Corporations, Directors and Executives: United States and Canada: 1974. 2 vols. New York: Standard & Poors, 1974.

"Support For Public TV Grows As More Viewers Pledge Aid." New York Times, 21 February 1973, p. 87.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1973. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Commerce. Public Broadcasting, Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on Commerce. 93rd Cong., 1st sess., 1973.

U.S. Federal Communications Commission, Federal Communications Commission Reports 27 FCC 2d Report and Order in the Matter of Primer on Ascertainment of Community Problems by Broadcast Applicants. Docket No. 18774. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

_____,Notice of Inquiry and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. FCC 73-930. In the Matter of Ascertainment of Community Problems by Educational Broadcast Applicants, Docket No. 19816, 19 February 1973.

"Westin, PBL Future Hanging in Balance." Broadcasting, 27 October 1968, p. 26.

"Westin & Barrett Issue PBL Memo Pointing Up Baord's Authority." Variety, 24 January 1968, pp. 32 & 47.

Unpublished materials

Advisory Council of National Organizations. "ACNO Hancbook." Washington, D.C., 1974. (Offset.)

KVST. "Channel 68/KVST-TV, Questions and Answers." Los Angeles, N.D. (Offset.)

_____, "KVST-TV's Primary Programming Objective and Policies." Los Angeles. n.d. (Offset.)

_____, "Nation's First Social Change Oriented Public Television Station." Los Anbeles, n.d. (Offset.)

National Friends of Public Broadcasting. "National Friends of Public Broadcasting." New York, 1974. (PR Booklet.)

PBS. "PBS Internal Document." Washington, D.C., 8 January 1974.

Letters

Frederickson, Sara G. personal letter, 29 October 1974.

Gushkin, Jessica R. personal letter, 17 October 1974.

Telephone Interviews

Ditzel, Thomas. Executive Director IEBN, 31 October 1974.

Haynie, Mrs. Kenneth R. NFPB Board of Trustees member. 1 November 1974.

New. Michael. Former Executive Coordinator, Friends of Educational Broadcasting, 21 October 1974.